arXiv:1409.1323v11 [cs.IT] 13 Mar 2015

A Constrained-Dictionary version of LZ78 asymptotically achieves the Finite-State Compressibility with a distortion measure

Jacob Ziv
Department of Electrical Engineering
Technion—Israel Institute of Technology
Haifa 3200003, Israel
Email: jz@ee.technion.ac.il

***Abstract*—The unrestricted-dictionary type LZ78 universal data-compression algorithm (as well as the LZ77 and LZW versions) achieves asymptotically, as the block-length tends to infinity, the FS compressibility, namely the best compression-ratio that may be achieved by any Information-lossless(IL) block-to-variable finite-state(FS) algorithm, for any infinitely-long individual sequence.**

One common practical heuristic approach is a constrained-dictionary version of LZ78, applying the "Least Recently Utilized" (LRU) deletion approach, where only the most recent D entries are kept in the dictionary (denoted by LZ78(LRU)).

In this note, for the sake of completeness, it is demonstrated again via a simple proof that the unrestricted LZ78 algorithm asymptotically achieves the FS-Compressibility. Then, it is demonstrated that the LZ78(LRU) information-lossless data-compression algorithm also achieves the FS compressibility, as the dictionary size D tends to infinity. Although this is perhaps not surprising, it does nevertheless yield a theoretical optimality argument for the popular LZ78(LRU) algorithm (and similarly, for the LZW(LRU) algorithm).

In addition, the finite-state compressibility of an individual sequence under a constrained allowable distance measure between the original sequence and the decompressed sequence is defined. It is demonstrated that a particular adaptive vector-quantizer that sequentially replaces clusters of L-vectors onto a single, cluster-representative L-vector, followed by a constrained D-entries-dictionary version of LZ78(LRU) as above, is asymptotically optimal as D tends to infinity and L=log D.

I. Introduction and Summary of Results:

Consider sequences $x_1^k = x_1, x_2, ..., x_k; x_i \in \mathbf{A}; i = 1, 2, ..., k$ where $|\mathbf{A}|$=A.

Also, let $\mathbf{x}=x_1^\infty$.

The unconstrained LZ78 universal data compression algorithm has been introduced in [1], where it is shown that when applied to an individual sequence x_1^n, as n tends to infinity, it achieves the FS compressibility.

Let a finite-state encoder be denoted by the triple $(\mathbf{S}, g, f)$ where $\mathbf{S}$ is a finite set of states, g:$\mathbf{S}$x$\mathbf{A}\rightarrowtail \mathbf{S}$, and f:$\mathbf{S}x\mathbf{A}\rightarrowtail \mathbf{B}^\star$, where $\mathbf{B}^\star$ is the set of all binary sequence.

For each starting state s_1, the triple defines a mapping from $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^\infty$ into $y \in \mathbf{B}^\infty$, where $y_i = f(s_i, x_i)$ is a (possibly empty) binary word, $s_{i+1} = g(s_i, x_i)$ is the next state and where $i = 1, 2, \ldots$.

An information-lossless (IL) finite-state encoder is one for which for each n, the sequence x_1^n is determined by y_1^n, s_1 and s_{n+1}.

The corresponding compression-ratio for x_1^n is $\frac{1}{n \log A}\sum_1^n L(y_i)$, where $L(y_i)$ is the length in bits of the (possibly empty) binary word y_i.

The minimum compression ratio for x_1^n over all finite-state IL encoders with at most s states is denoted by $\mathrm{FS}_s(x_1^n)$.

Also, let $\mathrm{FS}_s(\mathbf{x}) = \limsup_{\mathbf{n}\rightarrow\infty} \mathrm{FS}_\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x_1^n})$ and let the FS compressibility of $\mathbf{x}$ be defined by,

$$\mathrm{FS}(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\mathbf{s}\rightarrow\infty} \mathrm{FS}_\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Consider now the parsing of x_1^n into some c (not necessarily distinct) phrases:

$$x_1^n = \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{X}_j, \ldots, \mathbf{X}_c; \mathbf{X}_j = x_{i(j)}^{i(j+1)-1};$$
$$j = 1, 2, \ldots, c.$$

Let $\mathbf{Z}_j; j = 1, 2, \ldots, k; k \le c$ denote the k *distinct* substrings among the c phrases in x_1^n, where $s_{i,j}$ denotes the start state and $s_{o,j}$ denotes the end state of the phrase $\mathbf{Z}_j$.

Also, let $L(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_{i,j})$ denote the length of the binary codeword that is generated by the IL FS encoder above, when fed with $\mathbf{Z}_j$, given the start state $s_{i,j}$.

Let $p(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i, s_o)$ denote the empirical probability (i.e. fraction) of $\mathbf{Z}_j$ among all phrases that are characterized by a start state $s_{i,j} = s_i$ and an end state $s_{o,j} = s_o$.

Similarly, let $p(\mathbf{Z}_j)$ denote the the empirical probability of $\mathbf{Z}_j$ among the c phrases in x_1^n and let $p(s_i, s_o)$ denote the empirical probability of the pair of states (s_i, s_o) among the (initial,end) pairs of states of the c phrases.

The corresponding compression-ratio for x_1^n is

$$\frac{1}{n \log A} \sum_1^c L(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i) = \frac{c}{n \log A} \sum_{s_i=s(1)}^{s} \sum_{s_o=s(1)}^{s} p(s_i, s_o)$$
$$\sum_1^k p(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i.s_o) L(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i),$$

where $s(t); t = 1, 2, \ldots, s$ are the distinct states that appear at the start or at the end of any of the c phrases (at most s such states.

Lemma 1: Consider an arbitrary parsing of x_1^n into c substrings (phrases). Then,

$$FS_s(x_1^n) \geq \frac{c}{n \log A}\left[\sum_{\mathbf{1}}^{\mathbf{k}} (\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Z_j}) \log\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Z_j})}\right) - \mathbf{2}\log \mathbf{s})\right] - O\left(\frac{c}{n \log A}\right).$$

Proof:

For a given states pair s_i, s_o, an IL FS encoder outputs a distinct binary code-word for each of the c phrases that start with the state s_i and end with s_o. Observe that all such phrases may be permuted without changing the code-length for the whole sequences. Thus,counting the total number of such code-length preserving permutations

yields by Stirling formula [6]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_1^c p(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i.s_o)L(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i) \\ \geq \quad & \sum_1^c p(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i,s_o)\log\left(\frac{1}{p(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i.s_o)}\right) - O(\log c) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1 follows immediately by observing that $-\log p(\mathbf{Z}_j|s_i,s_o) \geq -\log p(\mathbf{Z}_j) - \log p(s_i,s_o)$. Now, in the case of LZ78 [1], all the c phrases that are generated for x_1^n, are all distinct (except perhaps of the last phrase). For example, in the case of the LZ78 algorithm, each new phrase is either an extension of a previous phrase by one letter, or a single letter that is not identical to any of the past single-letter phrases. The code length for each phrase is bounded by $\log C_n(\mathrm{LZ78})$+1+$\log A$, where $C_n(\mathrm{LZ78})$ is the number of distinct phrases that are generated by LZ78.

Therefore,

Lemma 2: For any individual sequence $\mathbf{x}$

$$\mathrm{FS}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n \log A}[(C_n(LZ)78)\log(C_n(\mathrm{LZ78})].$$

The main result in [1] follows from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 as follows:

The compression-ratio that is achieved for an individual sequence x_1^n that is parsed into C_n (LZ78) distinct phrases by LZ78 is upper-bounded by

$$\frac{1}{n \log A}\Big(C_n(\mathrm{LZ78})\Big)(\log C_n(\mathrm{LZ78}) + 1 + \log A).$$

Thus,

Lemma 3: The LZ78 universal IL data-compression algorithm asymptotically achieves $\mathrm{FS}(\mathbf{x})$.

Similarly, it follows that Lemma 3 holds for LZW [2] and LZ77 [3] as well. In practice, in order to avoid the ever growing size of the dictionary that contains all the past phrases that are generated by LZ78 (or similarly, by LZW), heuristic constrained-dictionary versions has been proposed.

Apparently, the preferred heuristics is the Last-Recently-Used (LRU) method [4]. In this case, only the most recent phrases (no larger than some preset number D) are kept in the dictionary.

This approach is analyzed below, and is shown to asymptotically achieve $\mathrm{FS}(\mathbf{x})$ as well.

Consider a constrain-dictionary LZ78 algorithm, where the dictionary has D entries, each no longer than $L_{\max} = (\log D)^2$ letters. Each newly generated phrase is a copy of the longest matched phrase among the previous D phrases, extended by the next incoming letter. If no match is found with any of the phrases in the dictionary, then the first incoming letter is the next phrase.

The new phrase is then included in the dictionary and the last recently used phrase is removed from the dictionary, except for the case where the newly generated phrase is of length $L_{\max} + 1$, in which case the dictionary is not updated.

The code length for each successive phrase is $\log D + 1 + \log A$. Denote this algorithm by LZ78(LRU).

Theorem 1: The compression-ratio that is achieved by LZ78(LRU) when applied to an individual $\mathbf{x}$ converges asymptotically to $\mathrm{FS}(\mathbf{x})$ as D tends to infinity.

Proof: Let $c(n)$ denote the number of phrases that are generated by LZ78(LRU) when applied to x_1^n and let $c(n|L_{\max}+1)$ denote the number of phrases of length $L_{\max}+1$.

By construction, $p(\mathbf{Z}_j) \leq \frac{1}{D}$ for any phrase Z_j among the c(n) phrases that are no longer than $L_{\max}$ since the number of phrases in between any such phrase and it's most recent previous appearance is at least D (since it is not included in the dictionary).

Let $\rho_{\mathrm{LZ78(RLU)}}(x_1^n) = \frac{C(n)}{n \log A}(\log D + 1 + \log A)$ denote the compression-ratio that is achieved by LZ78(RLU) when applied to x_1^n.

By Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{LZ78(RLU)}(x_1^n) &= \frac{C(n)}{n\log A}(\log D + 1 + \log A) \\ &\leq FS_s(x_1^n) + O\left(\frac{c(n)}{n\log A}(2\log s + 1 + \log A\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n\log A}c(n|L_{\max}+1)\log D + O\left(\frac{c(n)}{n\log A}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho_{LZ78(RLU)}(x_1^n)\left(1 - \frac{2\log s}{\log D}\right) \\ &\leq FS_s(x_1^n) + \frac{c(n)|L \leq L_{\max})}{n\log A}(\log D + 1 + \log A) \\ &\quad + O(\frac{c(n)}{n\log A}) + \frac{1}{n\log A}c(n|L = L_{\max}+1)\log D \end{aligned}$$

where $c(n|L = L_{\max} + 1)$ denotes the number of phrases among the $c(n)$ phrases, of length $L_{\max} + 1$.

Observe that $n \geq c(n|L = L_{\max} + 1)(L_{\max}$+1) and that $L_{\max}$=$(\log D)^2$. Also, by construction, $c(n)\log D \leq n\log A\rho_{LZ78(RLU)}(x_1^n)$ and hence, $\frac{c(n)}{n\log A} \leq \frac{\rho_{LZ78(RLU)}(x_1^n)}{\log D}$ which proves Theorem 1.

The same result holds for LZW(LRU) as well as for a sliding version of LZ77 where the window is set at $DL_{\max}$ and where the phrase length is constrained to be no larger than $L_{\max}$.

The fact that a sliding window version of LZ77, where the phrase is not constrained to be no longer than $L_{\max}$, yields a compression ratio that is equal to $\mathrm{FS}(\mathbf{x})$ was already established by P. Shields [5].

It should also pointed out that while LZ78 and LZW are *not* finite-state algorithms, LZ78(RLU), LZW(RLU) and the sliding-window version of the LZ77 algorithm are all elements of the class for which $\mathrm{FS}(\mathbf{x})$ is defined.

Now, let $d(x_1^i; y_1^i)$ denote some given distance measure between the vectors x_1^i and y_1^i, satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} & d(x_1^i; y_1^i) + d(x_{(i+1)}^{(i+j)}; y_{(i+1)}^{(i+j)}) \\ \geq & d(x_1^{(i+j)}; y_1^{(i+j)}) ;\ i, j = 1, 2, \ldots \end{aligned}$$

Let a finite-state distortion-limited (FSDL) encoder for L vectors be one such that for each starting state s_i, and an end state $s_o = g(s_i, x_1^L)$ it defines a mapping from $x_1^L \in \mathbf{A}^L$ to $Y(1) \in \mathbf{B}^\infty$, where $Y(1) = f(s_1, x_1^L)$ is a (possibly empty) word that, given the states s_i and s_o generates some vector $z_1^L \in \mathbf{A}^L$ such that $d(x_1^L; z_1^L) \leq L d_{\max}$.

This typifies cases (e.g. bio-genetics) where any two L-vectors for which the distance measure between the two vectors is no larger than $L d_{\max}$ are declared to be similar.

Consider the case where x_1^N is a concatenation of L substrings (phrases), where the length of each phrase is L where $N = cL$ is a multiple of L.

The corresponding minimal compression-ratio for x_1^N over all FS encoders with s states that satisfy the $d_{\max}$ condition is denoted by $\mathrm{FSLD}_s(x_1^N; d_{\max}|L) = \frac{1}{N \log A} \sum_{m=1}^{c} l(\mathbf{Y}(m))$, where $l(\mathbf{Y}(m))$ denotes the length of $\mathbf{Y}(m)$ that is associated with $\mathbf{X}(m)$ and the minimizing states, where $\mathbf{X}(m)$ is the m-th L-phrase in the parsed x_1^N.

The FSLD compressibility of $\mathbf{x}$ is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{FSLD}(\mathbf{x}; d_{\max}) \\ & = \limsup_{s \to \infty} \limsup_{L \to \infty} \\ & \quad \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{L}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{c} \mathrm{FSLD}_s(\mathbf{X}(m; d_{\max}|L) \end{aligned}$$

where $p(m)$ is the empirical probability of $\mathbf{Y}(m)$.

Thus, similar to Lemma 1 above,

Lemma 4:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{FSLD}_s(x_1^N; d_{\max}|L) \\ & \geq \frac{L}{N \log A} \sum_{m=1}^{c} p(m) \log \left(\frac{1}{p(m)} \right) - \frac{2 \log s}{L \log A} - O\left(\frac{1}{L \log A} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $p(m)$ is the empirical probability of $\mathbf{Y}(m)$.

Next, we describe an adaptive FS quantizing process for L-vectors, that when combined with the constrained dictionary version of LZ78(LRU) that is described above, asymptotically achieves $\mathrm{FSLD}(\mathbf{x})$.

Strings of length N are sequentially replaced by quantized phrases of length L as follows:

1) Parse each such N string into NL vectors.
2) Let $z_1^L(1) \in \mathbf{A}^L$ be the one L-vector that satisfies the d_{max} distortion criterion for the largest number of L-vectors in the incoming string and replace these L-vectors by $z_1^L(1)$.
3) Let $z_1^L(2) \in \mathbf{A}^L$ be the one L-vector that satisfies the d_{max} distortion criterion for the largest number of the remaining, unreplaced L-vectors in the N string and replace these L-vectors by $z_1^L(2)$.
4) In a similar way, generate $z_1^L(3)$, $z_1^L(4)$,... until all the L-vectors in the N sequence are replaced.
5) Sequentially feed the quantized N strings into a version of the constrained -dictionary LZ78(LRU) algorithm that is described above, where now the alphabet consists of L-vectors in $\mathbf{A}^L$ rather than single letters in A, and where D satisfies $\log D = L^3$ and $N \geq D \log D$.

The function $p \log \frac{1}{p}$ is convex and it's derivative, $\log \frac{1}{p} - \log \frac{1}{e}$ is positive for $0 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{e}$. Thus, for any $0 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{e}$:

$p \log \frac{1}{p} - (p - \delta) \log \frac{1}{p - \delta} \geq \delta (\log \frac{1}{p} - p \log \frac{1}{e}$ for $0 \leq \delta \leq p$.

Therefore, migrating L-vectors from any adaptive quantizer for L-vectors in the parsed input vector of length N, onto the adaptive L-vectors quantizer that is described above yields, by it's majorization construction, an empirical entropy that is no larger than that of the best adaptive L-vectors quantizer $\sum_{m=1}^{c} p(m) \log \left(\frac{1}{p(m)} \right)$ plus a constant term $2 \log \frac{1}{e}$.

Observe that the adaptive quantizer above is a finite-state machine with s(N) states where s(N) is bounded by O(A^{2L}) and where s_o=s_i within the quantized sequence.

By Lemma 4, Theorem 1 and since $\frac{\log s}{L}$ vanishes as D tends to infinity,

Theorem 2: The version LZ78(LRU) that is described above asymptotically achieves $\mathrm{FSLD}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{d}_{\max})$ as the dictionary size D tends to infinity.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Ziv and A. Lempel, "'Compression of Individual Sequences via Variable-Rate Coding", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT–24, no. 5, pp. 80–536, Sept. 1978.

[2] T. A. Welch, "A Technique for High-Performance Data Compression", *IEEE Computer*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 8–19, 1984.

[3] J. Ziv and A. Lempel, "Universal algorithm for sequential data compression", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT–23, no. 3, pp. 337–343, May 1977.

[4] S. S. DeAgostino, "Bounded Size Dictionary Compression: Relaxing the LRU Deletion Heurist", *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 17, pp. 1273-1280, 2006. vol. IT–44, no. 2, pp. 9–21, May 1998.

[5] P. Shields, "Performance of LZ Algorithm on Individual Sequences", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT–45, no. 4, pp. 1283–1288, May 1999.

[6] R. G. Gallager *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*, New York, Wiley, 1968.